

Generators for Symbolic Powers of Ideals Defining General Points of $\mathbf{P}^2$

Brian Harbourne

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0323
email: bharbourne@unl.edu
WEB: <http://www.math.unl.edu/~bharbour/>
August 6, 1995

I. Introduction

Let I be an ideal, homogeneous with respect to the usual grading, in a polynomial ring $R = k[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ in $n + 1$ variables (over an algebraically closed field k). Denote the graded component of I of degree d by I_d , and likewise the k -vector space of homogeneous forms of R of degree d by R_d . Since I is a graded R -module, we have k -linear maps $\mu_{d,i} : I_d \otimes R_i \rightarrow I_{d+i}$ given for each i and d by multiplication; when the index i (or the indices i and d) are clear from context, we will denote $\mu_{d,i}$ by μ_d or simply μ .

Definition I.1: Say that I has the *maximal rank property* if for each d either the kernel or cokernel of the homomorphism $\mu : I_d \otimes R_1 \rightarrow I_{d+1}$ vanishes. $\diamond$

Note that the number ν_{d+1} of generators of I of degree $d + 1$ in a minimal homogeneous set of generators is just the k -dimension of the cokernel of $\mu_{d,1}$. Thus for an ideal I with the maximal rank property one only needs to know the Hilbert function $H_I(d) = \dim(I_d)$ of I to determine ν_d for every d . This suggests why one might want to know under what conditions an ideal has the maximal rank property.

One situation which has attracted interest is that of points in projective space. If $p_1, \dots, p_r \in \mathbf{P}^n$ are distinct points, let $Z = p_1 + \dots + p_r$ denote the smooth subscheme given by the union of the points. Its corresponding homogeneous ideal $I(Z) \subset R$ is $I(Z) = I(p_1) \cap \dots \cap I(p_r)$, where $I(p_j)$ is for each j the ideal generated by all forms vanishing at p_j . Concerning such ideals there is the Ideal Generation Conjecture (IGC) of [Ro], [GO] and [GGR]:

Ideal Generation Conjecture I.2: *The ideal $I(Z)$ has the maximal rank property for a general set $Z = p_1 + \dots + p_r$ of r points in $\mathbf{P}^n$.*

Since, in the situation of the conjecture, the Hilbert function $H_{I(Z)}$ is known, the conjecture would allow one to determine numbers ν_d of generators in each degree d , and indeed the conjecture has been verified for a number of values of r and n (see [B], [GM], [HSV], [L], [O], [Ra]). Much less is understood or even conjectured in the more general situation of fat points (although we would draw your attention to [Cat] and [I]): a *fat point* subscheme $Z \subset \mathbf{P}^n$ is a subscheme defined by a homogeneous ideal I of the form $I(p_1)^{m_1} \cap \dots \cap I(p_r)^{m_r}$, where $p_1, \dots, p_r \in \mathbf{P}^n$ are distinct points of $\mathbf{P}^n$ and $m_1, \dots, m_r$ are nonnegative integers (not all zero); we denote Z by $m_1 p_1 + \dots + m_r p_r$ and refer to $I(Z) = I$ as a *fat point ideal*, or as an *ideal of fat points*. As in the case that Z is smooth, the fat point ideal $I(Z)$ is defined by base point conditions; i.e., the component $I(Z)_d$ of each degree d of $I(Z)$ is the linear system of all forms of degree d which vanish at each point p_i with multiplicity at least m_i .

Easy examples show that a strict extension of the IGC does not hold for fat point ideals; e.g., if $Z = 2p_1 + 2p_2 \subset \mathbf{P}^n$ with $n \geq 2$, then $I(Z)$ does not have the maximal rank property, which raises the

This work benefitted from a National Science Foundation grant.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 13P10, 14C99. Secondary 13D02, 13H15.

Key words and phrases. Ideal generation conjecture, symbolic powers, fat points.

question of how the number of generators in each degree can be determined for a fat point ideal. The ultimate goal of the line of research which we initiate with this paper is to understand minimal homogeneous sets of generators of ideals of the form $I(m_1p_1 + \cdots + m_rp_r)$, where $m_1, \dots, m_r$ are positive integers and $p_1, \dots, p_r$ are general points of $\mathbf{P}^n$. In the special case that $m_1 = \cdots = m_r = m$, we will refer to $Z = mp_1 + \cdots + mp_r$ as a *uniform fat point subscheme*; the ideal $I(Z)$ is then the symbolic power $(I(p_1 + \cdots + p_r))^{(m)}$. In this paper we determine the number of generators of each degree in a minimal homogeneous set of generators for any symbolic power $(I(p_1 + \cdots + p_r))^{(m)}$, where $p_1, \dots, p_r$ are $r \leq 9$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$, and we suggest a conjecture for $r > 9$.

Since the Hilbert functions of fat point subschemes of $\mathbf{P}^2$ supported at 9 or fewer points are known (see Remark II.3, or, more generally, [H4]), to determine numbers of generators in each degree it is enough to determine the ranks of the maps $\mu_{d,1}$, so it is this which will be our main concern. What we find (Lemma II.2) is that the cokernel of $\mu_{d,1}$ has two parts. One part is related to fixed components, and its dimension can be calculated by the same means as one computes the Hilbert functions of the fat point ideals themselves, so it is the second part which is of most interest. For uniform fat point subschemes of $\mathbf{P}^2$ supported at $r \leq 9$ general points, we show that maximal rank holds for this second part except in three families of cases (one family involving $r = 7$ points, and two families involving $r = 8$ points), for which we explicitly determine the dimension of the second part (see Theorem III.ii.1).

Taken together, our results allow one to recursively determine numbers of generators in each degree in a minimal homogeneous set of generators of any symbolic power $(I(p_1 + \cdots + p_r))^{(m)}$ of an ideal $I(p_1 + \cdots + p_r)$ corresponding to $r \leq 9$ general points $p_1, \dots, p_r$ of $\mathbf{P}^2$. Although results for $r > 9$ are unknown, we now discuss conjectures which would allow one to do the same in case $r > 9$, and which suggest that behavior for $r > 9$ is even simpler.

In particular, let us say that the Generalized Ideal Generation Conjecture (GIGC) on $\mathbf{P}^n$ holds for r if, for each $m > 0$, the maximal rank property for $I(mp_1 + \cdots + mp_r)$ holds for general points $p_1, \dots, p_r$ of $\mathbf{P}^n$. Then (as we will show) it turns out that:

Theorem I.3: *For $r \leq 9$, the GIGC on $\mathbf{P}^2$ holds if and only if r is 1, 4, or 9.*

The failure of the GIGC on $\mathbf{P}^2$ when r is nonsquare less than 9 is by Proposition II.4 guaranteed by the existence of uniform abnormal curves for such r . (Following Nagata [N1], a curve $C \subset \mathbf{P}^2$ of degree d whose multiplicity at each point p_i is at least m_i is said to be *abnormal* if $d\sqrt{r} < m_1 + \cdots + m_r$, and *uniform* if $m_1 = \cdots = m_r$.) Nagata [N1] proves that no abnormal curves occur for r generic points when r is a square, and he [N2] conjectures that none occur for $r > 9$. This prompts us, with some temerity perhaps, to propose the following conjecture:

Conjecture I.4: *The GIGC on $\mathbf{P}^2$ holds for all $r > 9$.*

This also suggests the following question:

Question I.5: *Is there an N depending on n , such that for each $r \geq N$ and each $m > 0$, $I(mp_1 + \cdots + mp_r)$ has the maximal rank property for general points $p_1, \dots, p_r$ of $\mathbf{P}^n$?*

In order to use Conjecture I.4 to actually determine numbers of generators for fat point subschemes of $\mathbf{P}^2$, one needs to be able to determine their Hilbert functions. Given $Z = mp_1 + \cdots + mp_r \subset \mathbf{P}^2$ for $r > 9$ sufficiently general points $p_1, \dots, p_r$, conjectures put forward in [H2] (equivalent to conjectures later put forward in [Hi], [Gi] and [H3]), imply that $H_{I(Z)}(t) = \max\{0, \binom{t+2}{2} - r\binom{m+1}{2}\}$ (i.e., each successive base condition mp_i conjecturally imposes the expected number of additional independent conditions on the remaining forms of degree t as long as any forms remain). Via Conjecture I.4 above, one can now find ν_d for each d . Moreover, since we are working on $\mathbf{P}^2$, the numbers ν_d and the Hilbert function of $I(Z)$ determine the graded modules in a minimal free resolution of $I(Z)$. For example, if $p_1, \dots, p_{10}$ are general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$ and $Z = 9(p_1 + \cdots + p_{10})$, by the conjectures above there should be 15 generators in degree 29, and 1 in degree 30. Denoting by R the homogeneous coordinate ring of $\mathbf{P}^2$, $I(Z)$ then would have the following minimal free resolution:

$$0 \rightarrow R^{15}[-31] \rightarrow R^1[-30] \oplus R^{15}[-29] \rightarrow I(Z) \rightarrow 0.$$

To close this introduction, we discuss the significance of $r = 9$ as the boundary between what is understood and what is conjectural. The approach taken in this paper is to work on the surface X obtained by blowing up the points $p_1, \dots, p_r \in \mathbf{P}^2$, using cohomological methods applied to invertible sheaves. For any $r \leq 9$ points the anticanonical class $-K_X$ is the class of an effective divisor; in this situation the geometry of divisors on X is understood [H4] and is used heavily in obtaining our results. For $r > 9$ sufficiently general points, $-K_X$ is not the class of an effective divisor and the geometry of divisors on X is not understood, raising a significant obstruction to extending our results to $r > 9$. In particular, whereas via [H4] one can determine the Hilbert function $H_{I(Z)}$ for any fat point subscheme $Z = m_1 p_1 + \dots + m_r p_r \subset \mathbf{P}^2$ supported at any $r \leq 9$ (even possibly infinitely near) points $p_1, \dots, p_r$, $H_{I(Z)}$ is unknown even for uniform fat point subschemes Z supported at $r > 9$ general points, and determining numbers of generators is a more delicate question than that of determining $H_{I(Z)}$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II we accumulate some notation and tools for working on surfaces. In Section III we apply these tools in our analysis of ideals of uniform fat point subschemes supported at $r \leq 9$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. Our analysis divides naturally into three cases, $r \leq 5$, $6 \leq r \leq 8$, and $r = 9$, which we treat separately.

Hereafter, R will denote the homogeneous coordinate ring $k[\mathbf{P}^2]$ of $\mathbf{P}^2$.

II. Background on Surfaces

We will obtain our results on fat point ideals on $\mathbf{P}^2$ by working on surfaces obtained by blowing up points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. We now establish the necessary connection. Let $p_1, \dots, p_r$ be distinct points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^2$ be the morphism obtained by blowing up each point p_i . Let E_i denote the exceptional divisor of the blow up of p_i , and let e_i denote its divisor class (modulo linear equivalence). Let e_0 denote the pullback to X of the class of a line in $\mathbf{P}^2$; the classes $e_0, \dots, e_r$ comprise a $\mathbf{Z}$ -basis of $\text{Pic}(X)$ (where we identify divisor classes with their corresponding invertible sheaves). Note that this basis is completely determined by π and in turn determines π . Also recall that $\text{Pic}(X)$ supports an intersection form, with respect to which the basis $e_0, \dots, e_r$ is orthogonal, satisfying $-1 = -e_0^2 = e_1^2 = \dots = e_r^2$, and that the canonical class of X is $K_X = -3e_0 + e_1 + \dots + e_r$.

Consider now a fat point subscheme $Z = m_1 p_1 + \dots + m_r p_r \subset \mathbf{P}^2$. Let $\mathcal{F}_d$ denote the class $de_0 - m_1 e_1 - \dots - m_r e_r$. Since e_0 is the pullback $\pi^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(1))$ of the class of a line, we have for each d and i a natural isomorphism of $H^i(X, \mathcal{F}_d)$ with $H^i(\mathbf{P}^2, \pi_*(-m_1 e_1 - \dots - m_r e_r) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(d)) = H^i(\mathbf{P}^2, \mathcal{I}_Z(d))$. In particular, the homogeneous coordinate ring $R = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} H^0(\mathbf{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(d))$ can be identified with $\bigoplus_{d \geq 0} H^0(X, de_0)$, and the homogeneous ideal $I(Z) = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} H^0(\mathbf{P}^2, \mathcal{I}_Z(d))$ in R can be identified with $\bigoplus_{d \geq 0} H^0(X, \mathcal{F}_d)$. Moreover, under these identifications, the natural homomorphisms $H^0(X, \mathcal{F}_d) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{F}_{d+1})$ and $I(Z)_d \otimes R_1 \rightarrow I(Z)_{d+1}$ correspond, so the dimension ν_{d+1} of the cokernel of the latter is equal to the dimension of the cokernel of the former.

Following [Mu], we will denote the kernel of $H^0(X, \mathcal{F}_d) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{F}_{d+1})$ by $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}_d, e_0)$ and the cokernel by $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_d, e_0)$, and their dimensions by $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_d, e_0)$ and $s(\mathcal{F}_d, e_0)$. Note that to say that $I(Z)_d \otimes R_1 \rightarrow I(Z)_{d+1}$, or equivalently that $H^0(X, \mathcal{F}_d) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{F}_{d+1})$, has maximal rank is just to say that $[\kappa(\mathcal{F}_d, e_0)][s(\mathcal{F}_d, e_0)] = 0$.

Our main tool comes from [Mu]:

Proposition II.1: *Let T be a closed subscheme of projective space, let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be coherent sheaves on T and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the class of an effective divisor C on T .*

- (a) *If the restriction homomorphisms $H^0(T, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow H^0(C, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)$ and $H^0(T, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow H^0(C, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)$ are surjective (for example, if $h^1(T, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{-1}) = 0 = h^1(T, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{B})$), then we have an exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{-1}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{-1}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow 0.$$

- (b) *If $H^0(T, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow H^0(C, \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)$ is surjective (for example, if $h^1(T, \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{-1}) = 0$), then $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, \mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)$.*

- (c) If T is a smooth curve of genus g , and $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are line bundles of degrees at least $2g + 1$ and $2g$, respectively, then $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = 0$.

Proof: See [Mu] for (a) and (c); we leave (b) as an easy exercise for the reader. $\diamond$

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the class of an effective divisor F on a surface X . Let $\mathcal{N}$ denote the class of the fixed part of the linear system $|F|$; then $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{N}$ (called the *free part* of $\mathcal{F}$) is fixed component free and has $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}) = h^0(X, \mathcal{H})$. The following lemma allows us to reduce a consideration of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0)$ to one of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}, e_0)$.

Lemma II.2: Let $e_0, \dots, e_r$ be the divisor class group basis corresponding to a blowing up $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^2$ at distinct points $p_1, \dots, p_r$, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a divisor class on X . If $\mathcal{F}$ is not the class of an effective divisor, then $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = h^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0)$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is the class of an effective divisor, let $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{N}$ be its decomposition into free and fixed parts; then $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = [h^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0) - h^0(X, \mathcal{H} + e_0)] + \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}, e_0)$.

Proof: The case that $\mathcal{F}$ is not effective is clear, so assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is the class of an effective divisor. Regarding $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ as invertible sheaves, we have an inclusion $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ which induces an isomorphism on global sections. Thus we have a commutative diagram with exact columns:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(X, \mathcal{H}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) & \rightarrow & H^0(X, \mathcal{H} + e_0) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(X, \mathcal{F}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) & \rightarrow & H^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0) \\ \downarrow & & \\ 0 & & \end{array}$$

The image of $H^0(X, \mathcal{H}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0)$ equals the image of $H^0(X, \mathcal{F}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0)$ but factors through $H^0(X, \mathcal{H} + e_0)$, which means that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}, e_0) + h^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0) - h^0(X, \mathcal{H} + e_0)$, giving the result. $\diamond$

Remark II.3: To determine generators for the ideal $I(Z)$ of some uniform fat point subscheme $Z = m(p_1 + \dots + p_r)$ of $\mathbf{P}^2$, it is enough by Lemma II.2 on the blow up X of $\mathbf{P}^2$ at $p_1, \dots, p_r$ to determine $h^0(X, de_0 - m(e_1 + \dots + e_r))$ for every d , and, for each d such that $h^0(X, de_0 - m(e_1 + \dots + e_r)) > 0$, to determine: the free part $\mathcal{H}$ of $de_0 - m(e_1 + \dots + e_r)$; $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}, e_0)$; and $h^0(X, \mathcal{H} + e_0)$. (Since this also suffices to determine the Hilbert function of $I(Z)$, it allows one in addition to write down a minimal free resolution of $I(Z)$, as in the example near the end of Section I and in Example III.ii.2.)

In the case of any $r \leq 9$ points, the results of [H4] provide a solution to determining $h^0(X, \mathcal{F})$ for any class $\mathcal{F}$, and, when $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}) > 0$, to finding the free part of $\mathcal{F}$. For $r \leq 9$ general points, these results are well known and can, in any case, be recovered from [H4] or [H1]; for the reader's convenience we recall the facts relevant to a uniform class $\mathcal{F}$ in the case of r general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$, first for $r \leq 8$, and then for $r = 9$. (A class $\mathcal{F}$ on a blowing up X of $\mathbf{P}^2$ at distinct points $p_1, \dots, p_r$ will be called a *uniform* class if $\mathcal{F} = de_0 - m(e_1 + \dots + e_r)$ for some nonnegative integers d and m .)

Let X be the blowing up of $r \leq 8$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is uniform and if it is the class of an effective divisor, then the fixed part $\mathcal{N}$ is also uniform, equal to $\Sigma t_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}$, where the sum is over all classes $\mathcal{E}$ of (-1) -curves and where $t_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the least nonnegative integer such that $(\mathcal{F} - t_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}) \cdot \mathcal{E} \geq 0$. The classes of the (-1) -curves are known; up to permutation of the indices, they are (see Section 26 of [Ma]): e_1 , $e_0 - e_1 - e_2$, $2e_0 - (e_1 + \dots + e_5)$, $3e_0 - (2e_1 + e_2 + \dots + e_7)$, $4e_0 - (2e_1 + 2e_2 + 2e_3 + e_4 + \dots + e_8)$, $5e_0 - (2e_1 + \dots + 2e_6 + e_7 + e_8)$, and $6e_0 - (3e_1 + 2e_2 + \dots + 2e_8)$. Now one can show that $\mathcal{N} = 0$ if $r = 1$ or 4 ; otherwise, $\mathcal{N}$ is a nonnegative multiple of: $e_0 - e_1 - e_2$ if $r = 2$; $3e_0 - 2e_1 - 2e_2 - 2e_3$ if $r = 3$; $2e_0 - (e_1 + \dots + e_5)$ for $r = 5$; $12e_0 - 5(e_1 + \dots + e_6)$, $r = 6$; $21e_0 - 8(e_1 + \dots + e_7)$, $r = 7$; or $48e_0 - 17(e_1 + \dots + e_8)$, $r = 8$. It also follows that a uniform class $de_0 - m(e_1 + \dots + e_r)$ is the class of an effective divisor if and only if $d \geq \epsilon_r m$, where $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1$, $\epsilon_3 = 3/2$, $\epsilon_4 = \epsilon_5 = 2$, $\epsilon_6 = 12/5$, $\epsilon_7 = 21/8$, and $\epsilon_8 = 48/17$.

Recall that a class being *numerically effective* means that in the intersection form it meets every effective divisor nonnegatively. In particular, the free part of the class of an effective divisor is numerically effective; conversely, if X is any blowing up of $\mathbf{P}^2$ at 8 or fewer points, general or not [H4], then any numerically effective

class $\mathcal{F}$ on X is the class of an effective divisor with no fixed components and has $h^1(X, \mathcal{F}) = h^2(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$, hence $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}) = (\mathcal{F}^2 - K_X \cdot \mathcal{F})/2 + 1$ by Riemann-Roch for surfaces.

Finally, let X be the blowing up of $r = 9$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. Then there is a unique smooth cubic through the 9 points, so $-K_X = 3e_0 - e_1 - \dots - e_9$ is numerically effective, the class of a smooth elliptic curve. If $\mathcal{F}$ is uniform, we can write $\mathcal{F} = te_0 - sK_X$ for uniquely determined integers t and $s \geq 0$, and $\mathcal{F}$ is the class of an effective divisor if and only if t is also nonnegative, in which case $h^1(X, \mathcal{F}) = h^2(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$, hence $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}) = (\mathcal{F}^2 - K_X \cdot \mathcal{F})/2 + 1$. Moreover, given $s \geq 0$, if $t > 0$, then $\mathcal{F}$ is fixed part free, while if $t = 0$, then $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}) = 1$. $\diamond$

The next result will be helpful in verifying failure of the GIGC. Call a uniform class $\mathcal{E} = de_0 - m(e_1 + \dots + e_r)$ on a blowing up X of $\mathbf{P}^2$ at distinct points $p_1, \dots, p_r$ *abnormal* if $\mathcal{E}$ is the class of an effective divisor with $d < \sqrt{r}m$ (note that this is equivalent to $\mathcal{E}^2 < 0$).

Proposition II.4: *Let X be a blowing up of r distinct points $p_1, \dots, p_r$ of $\mathbf{P}^2$. If X has a uniform abnormal class $\mathcal{E}$, then for some positive integers α and β , $I(\beta(p_1 + \dots + p_r))_\alpha \otimes R_1 \rightarrow I(\beta(p_1 + \dots + p_r))_{\alpha+1}$ does not have maximal rank.*

Proof: Since $\mathcal{E}$ is the class of an effective divisor of negative self-intersection, we can find positive integers a and b such that $ae_0 + b\mathcal{E}$ has nontrivial fixed part but such that $(a+1)e_0 + b\mathcal{E}$ has trivial fixed part. Now, $ae_0 + b\mathcal{E} = \alpha e_0 - \beta(e_1 + \dots + e_r)$ for some positive α and β . Since $a > 0$, $H^0(X, ae_0) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, (a+1)e_0)$ is not injective, hence neither is $H^0(X, ae_0 + b\mathcal{E}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, (a+1)e_0 + b\mathcal{E})$. Since $(a+1)e_0 + b\mathcal{E}$ is fixed component free but $ae_0 + b\mathcal{E}$ is not, we see $H^0(X, ae_0 + b\mathcal{E}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, (a+1)e_0 + b\mathcal{E})$ is also not surjective. Thus $H^0(X, ae_0 + b\mathcal{E}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, (a+1)e_0 + b\mathcal{E})$, and hence $I(\beta(p_1 + \dots + p_r))_\alpha \otimes R_1 \rightarrow I(\beta(p_1 + \dots + p_r))_{\alpha+1}$, do not have maximal rank. $\diamond$

The following result is well known (see Proposition 3.7 of [DGM]) and follows easily by appropriately applying Proposition II.1.

Lemma II.5: *Let $e_0, \dots, e_r$ be the classes corresponding to a blowing up $X \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^2$ at distinct points $p_1, \dots, p_r$. Let $Z = m_1p_1 + \dots + m_rp_r$, and let $\mathcal{F}_d$ denote $de_0 - m_1e_1 - \dots - m_re_r$. If ω_Z is the degree of a generator of greatest degree in a minimal homogeneous set of generators of $I(Z)$ (equivalently, μ_d is surjective for $d \geq \omega_Z$ but not for $d = \omega_Z - 1$) and if τ_Z is the least integer such that $h^1(X, \mathcal{F}_t) = 0$ for $t \geq \tau_Z$, then $\omega_Z \leq \tau_Z + 1$. In particular, $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_t, e_0) = 0$ for $t > \tau_Z$.*

Indeed, $\tau_Z + 1$ is just the regularity of $I(Z)$.

III. Main Results

We now work out our results for ideals of uniform fat point subschemes supported at $r \leq 9$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. We divide our analysis into three cases, $r \leq 5$, $6 \leq r \leq 8$, and $r = 9$, with the second case requiring most of the effort but also being the most interesting.

III.i. Five or Fewer General Points

By Lemma II.2 and Remark II.3, we are reduced to determining $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0)$ for numerically effective classes $\mathcal{F}$ on the blow up X of $\mathbf{P}^2$ at $r \leq 5$ general points. But any five or fewer general points in the plane lie on a smooth conic, so the results of [Cat] apply. Translating the results of [Cat] to the language used here and examining what [Cat] proves, we find that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$ for any numerically effective class $\mathcal{F}$. (In fact, [Cat] iteratively finds generators for and a resolution of $I(Z)$ for any fat point subscheme $Z = m_1p_1 + \dots + m_tp_t$, where $p_1, \dots, p_t$ are distinct points of a smooth plane conic, which includes the case of a uniform Z supported at 5 or fewer general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. From our perspective, the key fact in [Cat], not explicitly stated there, is that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$ for any numerically effective class $\mathcal{F}$ on the blow up X of points on a smooth conic, which reduces one, by Lemma II.2, to cohomology calculations already carried out in [H2]. Moreover, the key fact generalizes; see Remark III.i.1 below.)

Applying the foregoing to $Z = m(p_1 + \cdots + p_r)$ for $r \leq 5$ general points $p_1, \dots, p_r \in \mathbf{P}^2$ and $m > 0$, we have the following. For $r = 1$, it is easy to see that $I(Z)_t = 0$ for $t < m$ and that $te_0 - me_1$ is numerically effective for $t \geq m$. The former means that μ_t is injective for $t < m$, and by the preceding paragraph and numerical effectivity of $te_0 - me_1$ for $t \geq m$, we have $\mathcal{S}(te_0 - me_1, e_0) = 0$ for $t \geq m$, and hence μ_t is surjective for $t \geq m$. Thus the GIGC holds on $\mathbf{P}^2$ for $r = 1$. For $r = 4$, $I(Z)_t = 0$ for $t < 2m$, since $2e_0 - (e_1 + \cdots + e_4)$ is numerically effective but $[2e_0 - (e_1 + \cdots + e_4)] \cdot [te_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_4)] < 0$. Also, $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_t, e_0) = 0$ for $\mathcal{F}_t = te_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_4)$ and $t \geq 2m$, since $\mathcal{F}_t = m(2e_0 - (e_1 + \cdots + e_4)) + (t - 2m)e_0$ is numerically effective. Thus the GIGC holds on $\mathbf{P}^2$ also for $r = 4$.

To see that the GIGC on $\mathbf{P}^2$ fails for $r = 2, 3, 5$, it is enough by Proposition II.4 to find in each case a uniform abnormal class. But these have already been exhibited in Remark II.3: for $r = 2$, we have $e_0 - (e_1 + e_2)$; for $r = 3$, there is $3e_0 - 2(e_1 + e_2 + e_3)$; and for $r = 5$, $2e_0 - (e_1 + \cdots + e_5)$. One can check, in fact, that for $r = 2, 3, 5$, $I(m(p_1 + \cdots + p_r))$ fails to have the maximal rank property if and only if: $r = 2$ and $m \geq 2$; or $r = 3$ or $r = 5$ and $m \geq 3$.

Remark III.i.1: It turns out that the result that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$ for any numerically effective class on a blow up X of points on a smooth conic is true more generally. In fact, let $X \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^2$ be any projective birational morphism where X is smooth and projective (i.e., X is obtained by blowing up points, possibly infinitely near): If $-K_X - e_0$ is the class of an effective divisor (this is always true for a blowing up of points on a smooth conic), then $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$ for any numerically effective class $\mathcal{F}$ on X [H5]. So, by Lemma II.2, for any divisor class $\mathcal{G}$ on such an X we have $s(\mathcal{G}, e_0) = h^0(X, \mathcal{G} + e_0)$ if $\mathcal{G}$ is not the class of an effective divisor, or, if it is, $s(\mathcal{G}, e_0) = h^0(X, \mathcal{G} + e_0) - h^0(X, \mathcal{G}' + e_0)$, where $\mathcal{G}'$ is the free part of $\mathcal{G}$; and using the results of [H4], one can compute h^0 and the free part for any divisor class on X . [The condition that $-K_X - e_0$ be the class of an effective divisor just means that, in an appropriate sense, X is obtained by blowing up points on a conic (but the conic need not be irreducible and the points can be infinitely near). Thus for points $p_1, \dots, p_r$, possibly infinitely near, of a plane conic, possibly reducible or nonreduced, one can explicitly find a minimal set of generators for $I(Z)$, the Hilbert function of $I(Z)$, and a minimal free resolution for $I(Z)$, where Z is any fat point subscheme $Z = m_1p_1 + \cdots + m_rp_r$ (see [H5]).]

III.ii. Six to Eight General Points

We begin by pointing out that the GIGC fails by Proposition II.4 for $6 \leq r \leq 8$, since, as shown in Remark II.3, in each case the blow up of r general points supports a uniform abnormal class: for $r = 6$, $\mathcal{E} = 12e_0 - 5(e_1 + \cdots + e_6)$ is such; for $r = 7$, $\mathcal{E} = 21e_0 - 8(e_1 + \cdots + e_7)$ is such; and for $r = 8$, $\mathcal{E} = 48e_0 - 17(e_1 + \cdots + e_8)$ is such.

Thus the maximal rank property need not hold for ideals of the form $I(Z)$ where $Z = m(p_1 + \cdots + p_r)$ and $p_1, \dots, p_r$ are $6 \leq r \leq 8$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$, so, as discussed above, in order to find the number of generators in each degree in a minimal homogeneous set of generators, we need only find $s(\mathcal{F}, e_0)$ for numerically effective uniform classes $\mathcal{F}$ on the blow up X of the points. Unlike what happens for $r \leq 5$, however, $s(\mathcal{F}, e_0)$ need not vanish; we have instead:

Theorem III.ii.1: *Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(d, m, r)$ be a uniform numerically effective class on the blowing up of $6 \leq r \leq 8$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$ (where $\mathcal{F}(d, m, r)$ denotes $de_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_r)$).*

- (a) *If $r = 6$, then $\kappa(e_0, \mathcal{F})s(e_0, \mathcal{F}) = 0$.*
- (b) *If $r = 7$, then $\kappa(e_0, \mathcal{F})s(e_0, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ unless $\mathcal{F} = l\mathcal{F}(8, 3, 7)$ for $l \geq 3$, in which case $s(e_0, \mathcal{F}) = 7$.*
- (c) *If $r = 8$, then $\kappa(e_0, \mathcal{F})s(e_0, \mathcal{F}) = 0$, unless $\mathcal{F} = l\mathcal{F}(17, 6, 8)$ for $l \geq 9$, in which case $s(e_0, \mathcal{F}) = 48$, or unless $\mathcal{F} = l\mathcal{F}(17, 6, 8) + \mathcal{F}(3, 1, 8)$ for $l \geq 6$, in which case $s(e_0, \mathcal{F}) = 16$.*

Proof: Let $6 \leq r \leq 8$ and let $\mathcal{F} = de_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_r)$ be a uniform class. If $\mathcal{F}$ is numerically effective, then $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} + te_0) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ (by Remark II.3), so $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F} + te_0, e_0) = 0$ for all $t > 0$ by Lemma II.5. Thus we only need to consider $\mathcal{F} = \delta e_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_r)$, where δ is the least d such that $de_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_r)$ is numerically effective. Using Remark II.3 it follows that δ is the least positive integer d such that: $d \geq 12m/5$ if $r = 6$; $d \geq 21m/8$ if $r = 7$; or $d \geq 48m/17$ if $r = 8$.

First say $r = 6$ and let $\mathcal{F} = \delta e_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_6)$. If m is odd, then $\mathcal{F} = -K_X + (m - 1)(5e_0 - 2(e_1 + \cdots + e_6))/2$, while $\mathcal{F} = m(5e_0 - 2(e_1 + \cdots + e_6))/2$ if m is even. In any case $h^2(X, \mathcal{F} - e_0) = 0$ by duality.

If m is odd, one checks that $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - e_0) = 0$, and hence (by Lemma II.5) that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$. (Explicitly,

if m is odd, then each of the six (-1) -curves $2e_0 - (e_1 + \cdots + e_6) + e_i$ meets $\mathcal{F} - e_0$ negatively; thus either we have $\mathcal{E} = 12e_0 - 5(e_1 + \cdots + e_6)$ in the fixed part of $\mathcal{F} - e_0$ or we have $h^0(X, \mathcal{F} - e_0) = 0$. The latter happens for $m = 1, 3$, and the former if $m \geq 5$, in which case it is easy to check that $\mathcal{F} - e_0 - \mathcal{E}$ is numerically effective and hence that $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - e_0 - \mathcal{E}) = 0$. For $m = 1, 3$, $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - e_0) = 0$ now follows since $h^0 - h^1 + h^2$ applied to $\mathcal{F} - e_0$ vanishes by Riemann-Roch; $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - e_0) = 0$ also follows for $m \geq 5$, since $h^0(X, \mathcal{F} - e_0 - \mathcal{E}) = h^0(X, \mathcal{F} - e_0)$ and by Riemann-Roch and arithmetic $h^0 - h^1 + h^2$ gives the same result applied either to $\mathcal{F} - e_0 - \mathcal{E}$ or to $\mathcal{F} - e_0$.

Now suppose $m = 2s$, with $s \geq 2$. For $s = 2$, $e_0 \cdot (\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E} + e_0) = -1$, so $h^0(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E} + e_0) = 0$ so $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E}, e_0) = 0$. For $s > 2$, $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E}$ is numerically effective with odd uniform multiplicity, so by the preceding paragraph $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E}, e_0) = 0$. Let E be the effective divisor whose class is $\mathcal{E}$. Then $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E = \mathcal{O}_E$, and using Proposition II.1(b) it is easy to check that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O}_E, e_0) = 0$. If we check that $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E} + e_0) = 0$ and $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E}) = 0$, then we can apply Proposition II.1(a) to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ to obtain $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$. But for $s > 2$, we have $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E} + e_0) = 0$ and $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E}) = 0$ by Remark II.3. For $s = 2$, we have $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E} = K_X + e_0$ and $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E} + e_0 = K_X + 2e_0$, so using duality and descending to $\mathbf{P}^2$ we see $h^1(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E} + ae_0) = h^1(\mathbf{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(1 - a)) = 0$ for any a .

We are left with the case $m = 2$; apply Proposition II.1 to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, where C is the (-1) -curve whose class is $\mathcal{C} = 2e_0 - e_1 - \cdots - e_5$. Since $h^0(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}) = 2$ and $e_0 \cdot (\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}) = 3$, the sections of $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}$ correspond to a pencil of cubic plane curves, so we see $\kappa(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}, e_0) = 0$ (i.e., any nontrivial element of the kernel of $H^0(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C} + e_0)$ must be of the form $f \otimes l_1 - g \otimes l_2$, where f and g define distinct elements of the cubic pencil and l_1 and l_2 define distinct lines, which means that f and g have a factor in common corresponding to a plane conic curve, but $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}$ is numerically effective so fixed part free by Remark II.3, so no such common factor is possible), so $s(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}, e_0) = h^0(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C} + e_0) - h^0(X, \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C})h^0(X, e_0)$ which we compute to be 1. By a similar dimension count, we see $s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) \geq 1$, but by Proposition II.1(b),(c) we have $s(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, e_0) = 0$. Thus $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}, e_0)$ surjects onto $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0)$ by Proposition II.1(a) so in fact $s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 1$, hence $\kappa(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$, whence $\kappa(\mathcal{F}, e_0)s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$ as claimed.

The cases of $r = 7$ and 8 general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$ are handled similarly so we indicate these in less detail. So now say $r = 7$; given an integer $m > 0$, let $\mathcal{F}_m$ denote $\delta e_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_7)$, where δ is the least positive integer d such that $de_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_7)$ is numerically effective but $(d - 1)e_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_7)$ is not. Write $m = 3s + t$, where $0 \leq t < 3$ is the remainder when m is divided by 3. Then $\mathcal{F}_m = s\mathcal{F}_3 - tK_X$, where $\mathcal{F}_3 = 8e_0 - 3(e_1 + \cdots + e_7)$. Also, let E be the effective divisor whose class is $\mathcal{E} = 21e_0 - 8(e_1 + \cdots + e_7)$; E is a union of seven disjoint (-1) -curves.

For $t = 2$, we have $h^1(X, \mathcal{F}_m - e_0) = 0$ which gives $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_m, e_0) = 0$, so now consider $t = 1$. If $s \geq 2$, then $h^1(X, \mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E} + e_0) = h^1(X, \mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}) = 0$, so, if we show that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}, e_0)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{E}, e_0)$ vanish, we conclude $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_m, e_0) = 0$ by applying Proposition II.1(a) to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$. For $s \geq 3$ we have $\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}_{3(s-3)+2}$, for which we have already established $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}, e_0) = 0$, while for $s = 2$ we have $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E} + e_0) = 0$, so again $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}, e_0) = 0$. Also, $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E, e_0) = 0$: E is a disjoint union of seven (-1) -curves, and for each of these curves C we have $\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_C = \mathcal{O}_C(1)$, so it is enough to show that $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1)) \otimes \Gamma(e_0) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1) \otimes e_0) = \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(4))$ is surjective. But the restriction $V \subset \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(3))$ of $\Gamma(e_0)$ to C is a base point free cubic web, and it is not hard to check for such a V that $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1)) \otimes V$ surjects to $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(4))$, as required.

In the $t = 1$ case we are left with treating $s = 1$ and $s = 0$. For $s = 1$, we have $m = 4$, which we handle by applying Proposition II.1(a) to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(2e_0 - e_4 - \cdots - e_7) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_4) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_4 \otimes \mathcal{O}_D) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, where D is a section of $9e_0 - 4e_1 - 4e_2 - 4e_3 - 3e_4 - \cdots - 3e_7$. The conclusion now follows since $\mathcal{S}(2e_0 - e_4 - \cdots - e_7, e_0) = 0$ by Subsection III.i, and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_4 \otimes \mathcal{O}_D, e_0) = 0$ by an argument similar to that used above for $s \geq 2$, keeping in mind that D is a union of three of the seven (-1) -curves comprising E . For $s = 0$, we have $m = 1$, so $\mathcal{F}_m = -K_X$, which we handle by applying Proposition II.1(a),(c) to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_D) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, where now D is a smooth section of $-K_X$ (and hence a smooth elliptic curve).

There remains only the $t = 0$ case. For $s \geq 3$, we have $\mathcal{F}_{3s} - \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}_{3(s-3)+1}$, so $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_{3s} - \mathcal{E}, e_0) = 0$. Also, $s(\mathcal{F}_{3s} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E, e_0) = 7$, since E has seven components and on each component C we have $\mathcal{F}_{3s} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C = \mathcal{O}_C$, so the images of $H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C) \otimes H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C(3))$ and $H^0(X, e_0) \rightarrow H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C(3))$ are equal, but the latter has 1 dimensional cokernel. Now we apply Proposition II.1 to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ to conclude $s(\mathcal{F}_{3s}, e_0) = 7$.

We are left with $s = 1$ and 2, which we handle by applying Proposition II.1 to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{3s} - \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{3s}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{3s} \otimes \mathcal{O}_D) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, using $\mathcal{D} = 9e_0 - 4e_1 - 4e_2 - 4e_3 - 3e_4 - \cdots - 3e_7$ (as above) for

$s = 1$ (obtaining $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_3 - \mathcal{D}, e_0) = 0 = \kappa(\mathcal{F}_3 \otimes \mathcal{O}_D, e_0)$ and hence $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_3, e_0) = 0$, from which we compute $s(\mathcal{F}_3, e_0) = 4$), and using $\mathcal{D} = 18e_0 - 7e_1 - \cdots - 7e_6 - 6e_7$ for $s = 2$ (obtaining $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_6 - \mathcal{D}, e_0) = 0 = \kappa(\mathcal{F}_6 \otimes \mathcal{O}_D, e_0)$ and hence $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_6, e_0) = 0$ and so $s(\mathcal{F}_6, e_0) = 6$).

In conclusion, for $r = 7$, $\kappa(\mathcal{F}, e_0)s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$ for all numerically effective uniform classes $\mathcal{F}$ except $\mathcal{F} = l\mathcal{F}_3$ for $l \geq 3$, in which case $s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 7$.

We now proceed to the last case, for which X is a blow up of $r = 8$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. Here we let E be the effective divisor whose class is $\mathcal{E} = 48e_0 - 17(e_1 + \cdots + e_8)$; E is a union of eight disjoint (-1) -curves, each of which comes from a plane sextic with seven double points and a triple point. Using notation analogous to that above, $\mathcal{F}_m$ denotes the class $\delta e_0 - m(e_1 + \cdots + e_8)$, where $\mathcal{F}_m$ is numerically effective but $\mathcal{F}_m - e_0$ is not. Similarly to what was done above, we can write $\mathcal{F}_m = s\mathcal{F}_6 - tK_8$, where $\mathcal{F}_6 = 17e_0 - 6(e_1 + \cdots + e_8)$ and $0 \leq t < 6$ is the remainder when m is divided by s .

Following the pattern for 7 points, we find $h^1(X, \mathcal{F}_{6s+5} - e_0) = 0$ for $s \geq 0$, hence $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_{6s+5}, e_0) = 0$ for all $s \geq 0$, and we find $\mathcal{F}_{6s+t} - \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}_{6(s-3)+t+1}$ and hence $h^1(X, \mathcal{F}_{6s+t} - \mathcal{E} + e_0) = h^1(X, \mathcal{F}_{6s+t} - \mathcal{E}) = 0$ if $s \geq 3$ and $0 \leq t < 5$. Thus for $m \geq 18$ we can apply Proposition II.1 to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$. To do so we will need to determine $s(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E, e_0)$ (or, equivalently, $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E, e_0)$). As we might expect from the case of seven points, if $\mathcal{C}$ is the class of any component C among the eight components of E , then $s(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E, e_0) = 8s(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, e_0)$, so we may restrict our attention to C . Note that $\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_C = -tK_8 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C = \mathcal{O}_C(t)$. For $t = 0$, clearly $\kappa(\mathcal{O}_C, e_0) = 0$ (a linear form times a nonzero constant cannot vanish on a sextic) whence $s(\mathcal{O}_C, e_0) = 4$.

For $t = 1$, again $\kappa(\mathcal{O}_C(1), e_0) = 0$, whence $s(\mathcal{O}_C(1), e_0) = 2$: letting x and y be a basis for $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1))$, a nontrivial element of $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1)) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ which maps to 0 in $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1) \otimes e_0) = \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(7))$ gives an equation $xf = yg$, where f and g are restrictions to C of distinct lines in $\mathbf{P}^2$. But f and g have degree 6, so $xf = yg$ implies f and g have 5 zeros on C in common. Since the image of C in $\mathbf{P}^2$ has at most a triple point, two distinct lines can have at most 3 points of C in common, contradicting there being a nontrivial element of the kernel.

For $t = 2$, both $\kappa(\mathcal{O}_C(2), e_0)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O}_C(2), e_0)$ vanish: let x and y be as before and let f, g, h be a basis for the restriction of $\Gamma(e_0)$ to C such that f and g correspond to lines in $\mathbf{P}^2$ which meet at the triple point of the image of C in $\mathbf{P}^2$. If $\kappa(\mathcal{O}_C(2), e_0) \neq 0$, then we have an equation $q_1f + q_2g + q_3h = 0$, where q_1, q_2, q_3 (not all 0) lie in the span of $\{x^2, xy, y^2\}$. Since f and g have exactly 3 zeros in common, we cannot have $q_3 = 0$, and so h also has a zero in common with f and g , which gives the contradiction that the restriction of $\Gamma(e_0)$ to C has a base point. Thus $\kappa(\mathcal{O}_C(2), e_0) = 0$ from which we easily compute $s(\mathcal{O}_C(2), e_0) = 0$.

For $t = 3, 4$ or 5 , we have $s(\mathcal{O}_C(t), e_0) = 0$: say $t = 3$ ($t = 4$ or 5 are similar). Let x and y be as above; thus cubics in x and y span $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(3))$. But $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1)) \otimes \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(2))$ surjects onto $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(3))$, and, by the previous case, $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(2)) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ surjects onto $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(8))$, so $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(3)) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ and $(\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1)) \otimes \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(2))) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ and $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1)) \otimes \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(8))$ all have the same image in $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(9))$. Since C is rational, we know $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(1)) \otimes \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(8))$ surjects onto $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_C(9))$, whence $s(\mathcal{O}_C(t), e_0) = 0$.

Now apply Proposition II.1 to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$. For $m = 6s + 4$, $s(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_E, e_0) = 0$ and for $s \geq 3$ we have $\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}_{6(s-3)+5}$, so $s(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{E}, e_0) = 0$; thus for $t = 4$ and $s \geq 3$ we have $s(\mathcal{F}_m, e_0) = 0$. To handle $s = 0$, note that $\mathcal{F}_4 = -4K_X$, and indeed, for $m < 6$, $\mathcal{F}_m = -mK_X$. But for $-mK_X$ with $m < 5$ we apply Proposition II.1(a,b,c) to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(-(m-1)K_X) \rightarrow \Gamma(-mK_X) \rightarrow \Gamma(-mK_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, where C is a smooth section of $-K_X$, hence an elliptic curve. It follows that $s(-K_X, e_0) = 1$ and $\kappa(-K_X, e_0) = 0$, and, if $s(-2K_X, e_0) = 0$, that $s(-mK_X, e_0) = 0$ for $m = 3$ and 4 (we already know $s(-mK_X, e_0) = 0$ for $m = 5$). To check $s(-2K_X, e_0) = 0$, apply Proposition II.1 to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(-2K_X - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(-2K_X) \rightarrow \Gamma(-2K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, where C is the (-1) -curve whose class is $6e_0 - 3e_1 - 2e_2 - \cdots - 2e_8$.

To handle $t = 4$ and $s = 1$, apply Proposition II.1 to $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{C} + K_X) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_D) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, where D is a smooth section of $-K_X$, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{F}_{10} - \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G} = 24e_0 - 9(e_1 + \cdots + e_4) - 8(e_5 + \cdots + e_8)$ is the class of the union of four disjoint sextic (-1) -curves. This shows $s(\mathcal{C}, e_0) = 0$, which by considering $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{10} - \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{10}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{10} \otimes \mathcal{O}_G) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, where G is the effective divisor whose class is $\mathcal{G}$, shows $s(\mathcal{F}_{10}, e_0) = 0$. The case of $t = 4$ and $s = 2$ is similar, but with $\mathcal{G} = 42e_0 - 15(e_1 + \cdots + e_7) - 14e_8$ the union of seven (-1) -curves.

In a similar way, since now $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+4}, e_0) = 0$ for all $s \geq 0$, we find $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+3}, e_0) = 0$ for all $s \geq 3$ and we are left with the cases $s = 1$ and 2 ($s = 0$ was done above). For $s = 1$, consider $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ with $\mathcal{C} = 24e_0 - 9(e_1 + \cdots + e_4) - 8(e_5 + \cdots + e_8)$; for $s = 2$, replace $24e_0 - 9(e_1 + \cdots + e_4) - 8(e_5 + \cdots + e_8)$ by $42e_0 - 15(e_1 + \cdots + e_7) - 14e_8$. We find for all $s \geq 0$ that

$$s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+3}, e_0) = 0.$$

With this in hand, following the same pattern for $t = 2$ we find $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+2}, e_0) = 0$ for all $s \geq 3$. We have done the $s = 0$ case above; for $s = 1$ consider first $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_8 - \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_8 - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma((\mathcal{F}_8 - \mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_D) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ where $\mathcal{D} = 2e_0 - e_4 - \dots - e_8$ is a (-1) -curve and $\mathcal{C} = 18e_0 - 7(e_1 + e_2 + e_3) - 6(e_4 + \dots + e_8)$ is the union of three (-1) -curves, then consider $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_8 - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_8) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_8 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$, to show $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_8, e_0) = 0$ and $s(\mathcal{F}_8, e_0) = 1$.

Now consider $s = 2$; i.e., $\mathcal{F}_{14}$. Using $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{14} - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{14}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{14} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ with $\mathcal{C} = 36e_0 - 13(e_1 + \dots + e_6) - 12(e_7 + e_8)$, we find by Proposition II.1 that $s(\mathcal{G}, e_0) = s(\mathcal{F}_{14}, e_0)$, where $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_{14} - \mathcal{C} = 4e_0 - (e_1 + \dots + e_6) - 2(e_7 + e_8)$. To see that $s(\mathcal{G}, e_0) = 0$, note that $H^0(X, \mathcal{G}) \otimes H^0(X, e_0)$ and $H^0(X, \mathcal{G} + e_0)$ both have dimension 9. Let $V \subset H^0(X, \mathcal{G})$ be the linear subsystem with a fixed component corresponding to a line through p_7 and p_8 ; i.e., V is the cubic pencil of sections of $-K_X$ plus a fixed component whose class is $e_0 - e_7 - e_8$. Note that the image V' of $V \otimes H^0(X, e_0)$ in $H^0(X, \mathcal{G} + e_0)$ has dimension 6 and a base point off the fixed component (the base point being that of the cubic pencil). Let $W \in H^0(X, \mathcal{G})$ be the element associated to the divisor whose two components are the (-1) -curves whose classes are $2e_0 - e_1 - e_2 - e_3 - e_7 - e_8$ and $2e_0 - e_4 - e_5 - e_6 - e_7 - e_8$. Let W' be the image of $W \otimes H^0(X, e_0)$ in $H^0(X, \mathcal{G} + e_0)$; by dimension count, if V' and W' have only 0 in common, then $s(\mathcal{G}, e_0) = 0$. But any element of W' corresponds to a conic Q_1 through p_1, p_2, p_3, p_7, p_8 , another conic Q_2 through p_4, p_5, p_6, p_7, p_8 , and a line L_1 , while any element of V' corresponds to a line L_2 through p_7 and p_8 and a quartic Q_3 through the base point of the cubic pencil. For 8 general points we may assume that the base point of the cubic pencil is not on either conic nor on L_2 , so $Q_1 + Q_2 + L_1 = Q_3 + L_2$ implies that L_1 passes through the base point and hence that $L_1 \neq L_2$. But this forces L_2 to be a component of $Q_1 + Q_2$, which it is not. Thus V' and W' meet only at 0, so $s(\mathcal{G}, e_0) = 0$, whence $0 = s(\mathcal{F}_{14}, e_0) = \kappa(\mathcal{F}_{14}, e_0)$.

We now have shown in all cases with $2 \leq t \leq 5$ that $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{6s+t}, e_0)s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+t}, e_0) = 0$.

Turning to $t = 1$ with the same method, we find that $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0) = s(\mathcal{F}_{6(s-3)+2}, e_0) + s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E, e_0)$ for all $s \geq 3$, hence $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0) = s(\mathcal{F}_{6(s-3)+2}, e_0) + 16$ for $s \geq 3$, so $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0) = 16$ for $s = 3$ and for $s \geq 5$, but $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0) = 17$ for $s = 4$. Using this we check $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0) = 0$ for $s = 3, 4$ and 5, but $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0) > 0$ for $s > 5$. The case $s = 0$ was done above, giving $s(\mathcal{F}_1, e_0) = 1$ and $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_1, e_0) = 0$; for $s = 1$, consider $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_7 - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_7) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_7 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ with $\mathcal{C} = 18e_0 - 7(e_1 + e_2 + e_3) - 6(e_4 + \dots + e_8)$ the union of three (-1) -curves, to show $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_7, e_0) = 0$ and $s(\mathcal{F}_7, e_0) = 8$. For $s = 2$, consider $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{13} - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{13}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{13} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ with $\mathcal{C} = 36e_0 - 13(e_1 + \dots + e_6) - 12(e_7 + e_8)$ the union of six (-1) -curves, to show $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{13}, e_0) = 0$ and $s(\mathcal{F}_{13}, e_0) = 13$. Thus we see that $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0)s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0) = 0$ for $0 \leq s \leq 5$, while $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s+1}, e_0) = 16$ for $s > 5$.

Finally we have $t = 0$; here $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0) = s(\mathcal{F}_{6(s-3)+1}, e_0) + s(\mathcal{F}_{6s} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E, e_0)$ for all $s \geq 3$, hence $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0) = s(\mathcal{F}_{6(s-3)+1}, e_0) + 32$ for $s \geq 3$, from which we get $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0) = 0$ and $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0) = 33, 40, 45, 48, 49, 48$ for $s = 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8$ respectively, and $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0) > 0$ but $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0) = 48$ for $s \geq 9$. For $s = 1$, consider $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_6 - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_6) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_6 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ with $\mathcal{C} = 18e_0 - 7(e_1 + e_2 + e_3) - 6(e_4 + \dots + e_8)$ the union of three (-1) -curves, to show $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_6, e_0) = 0$ and $s(\mathcal{F}_6, e_0) = 13$. For $s = 2$, consider $(0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{12} - \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{12}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{12} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0) \otimes \Gamma(e_0)$ with $\mathcal{C} = 30e_0 - 11(e_1 + \dots + e_5) - 10(e_6 + e_7 + e_8)$ the union of five (-1) -curves, to show $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{12}, e_0) = 0$ and $s(\mathcal{F}_{12}, e_0) = 24$. Thus we see that $\kappa(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0)s(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0) = 0$ for $0 \leq s \leq 8$, while $s(\mathcal{F}_{6s}, e_0) = 48$ for $s > 8$. $\diamond$

We end this section with an example, using our results to obtain a resolution of the ideal defining a fat point subscheme.

Example III.ii.2: Consider eight general points, each taken with multiplicity $m = 205$; thus $Z = 205(p_1 + \dots + p_8)$. Then $I(Z)$ has: 10 generators in degree 579 (since 579 is the first degree d such that $I(Z)_d \neq 0$, and we have $\dim_k I(Z)_{579} = 10$); 201 generators in degree 580 (since, for $d = 579$, $\mathcal{F}_d = de_0 - 205(e_1 + \dots + e_8)$ has free part $\mathcal{H} = 51e_0 - 18(e_1 + \dots + e_8)$ and fixed part $\mathcal{N} = 528e_0 - 187(e_1 + \dots + e_8)$, and here $s(e_0, \mathcal{F}_d) = s(e_0, \mathcal{H}) + (h^0(X, e_0 + \mathcal{F}_d) - h^0(X, \mathcal{H} + e_0)) = 33 + 168$); 208 in degree 581 (since, for $d = 580$, $\mathcal{H} = 340e_0 - 120(e_1 + \dots + e_8)$ and $\mathcal{N} = 240e_0 - 85(e_1 + \dots + e_8)$, and $s(e_0, \mathcal{F}_d) = 48 + 160$); and 16 in degree 582 (since, for $d = 581$, $\mathcal{H} = 581e_0 - 205(e_1 + \dots + e_8)$ and $\mathcal{N} = 0$, and $s(e_0, \mathcal{F}_d) = 16 + 0$). Moreover, the regularity of $I(Z)$ is 582, so there are no other generators. (These numbers can be compared with Campanella's bounds [Cam]: $10 \leq \nu_{579} \leq 10$, $201 \leq \nu_{580} \leq 210$, $70 \leq \nu_{581} \leq 280$, and $0 \leq \nu_{582} \leq 79$.)

From this data we easily determine a minimal free resolution for $I(Z)$, as follows:

$$0 \rightarrow R^{138}[-581] \oplus R^{216}[-582] \oplus R^{80}[-583] \rightarrow R^{10}[-579] \oplus R^{201}[-580] \oplus R^{208}[-581] \oplus R^{16}[-582] \rightarrow I(Z) \rightarrow 0.$$

III.iii. Nine General Points

Now let $p_1, \dots, p_9$ be distinct general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$; clearly, we may assume that they lie on a smooth plane cubic C' . Let X be the surface obtained by blowing up the nine points, and let C denote the proper transform of C' . Note that C is a section of $-K_X$ and that C is numerically effective with $C^2 = 0$.

Given any uniform class $\mathcal{F} = de_0 - m(e_1 + \dots + e_9)$, by Remark II.3 we can write $\mathcal{F} = (d - 3m)e_0 - mK_X$, with $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}) > 0$ if and only if $d \geq 3m$, in which case $h^1(X, \mathcal{F}) = h^2(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$, hence $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}) = (\mathcal{F}^2 - K_X \cdot \mathcal{F})/2 + 1$. Thus we know h^0 for any uniform class $\mathcal{F}$. We now determine $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0)$.

Theorem III.iii.1: *Let $\mathcal{F} = te_0 - mK_X$ with $m \geq 0$, where X is the blowing up of $r \geq 9$ general points of a smooth plane cubic C .*

- (a) *If $t > 0$ or $t < -1$, then $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$.*
- (b) *If $t = 0$, then $s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 3m$ and $\kappa(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$.*
- (c) *If $t = -1$, then $s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 1$ and $\kappa(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$.*

Proof: (a) If $t < -1$, then $h^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0) = 0$, hence $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$, so assume that $t > 0$. Note that $-K_X \cdot (te_0 - mK_X) > 1$ implies $-K_X \cdot (te_0 - sK_X) > 1$ for all $0 \leq s \leq m$. We will induct on s , starting with the obvious fact that $\mathcal{S}(te_0, e_0) = 0$ for $t \geq 0$. So now we may assume that $0 < s \leq m$, and that $\mathcal{S}(te_0 - (s-1)K_X, e_0) = 0$. Since $h^1(X, te_0 - (s-1)K_X) = h^1(X, te_0 - (s-1)K_X + e_0) = 0$, and $h^1(X, e_0 + K_X) = h^1(X, -e_0) = h^1(\mathbf{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(-1)) = 0$, by Proposition II.1(a,b) we have the exact sequence $\mathcal{S}(te_0 - (s-1)K_X, e_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(te_0 - sK_X, e_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}((te_0 - sK_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, e_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow 0$, where the leftmost term vanishes by induction, and $\mathcal{S}((te_0 - sK_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, e_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) = 0$ by Proposition II.1(c). Thus $\mathcal{S}(te_0 - sK_X, e_0) = 0$ follows by exactness.

(b) Since $h^0(X, -mK_X) = 1$, $\mathcal{R}(-mK_X, e_0)$ clearly vanishes, so $s(-mK_X, e_0) = h^0(X, -mK_X + e_0) - h^0(X, -mK_X) = 0$, and $h^0(X, e_0) = 3m$.

(c) If $t = -1$, then $h^0(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ and $h^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0) = 1$, so $\kappa(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$ and $s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = h^0(X, \mathcal{F} + e_0) = 1$.

◇

Corollary III.iii.2: *The GIGC holds on $\mathbf{P}^2$ for $r = 9$.*

Proof: By Theorem III.iii.1, we see $\kappa(\mathcal{F}, e_0)s(\mathcal{F}, e_0) = 0$ for any uniform class on X . Thus $I(Z)$ has the maximal rank property for any uniform fat point subscheme Z supported at nine general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. ◇

References

- [B] Ballico, E. *Generators for the homogeneous ideal of s general points in $\mathbf{P}^3$* , J. Alg. 106 (1987), 46–52.
- [Cam] Campanella, G. *Standard bases of perfect homogeneous polynomial ideals of height 2*, J. Alg. 101 (1986), 47–60.
- [Cat] Catalisano, M. V. *“Fat” points on a conic*, Comm. Alg. 19(8) (1991), 2153–2168.
- [DGM] Davis, E. D., Geramita, A. V., and Maroscia, P. *Perfect Homogeneous Ideals: Dubreil’s Theorems Revisited*, Bull. Sc. math., 2^e série, 108 (1984), 143–185.
- [GO] Geramita, A. V. and Orrechia, F. *Minimally generating ideals defining certain tangent cones*, J. Alg. 78 (1982), 36–57.
- [GM] Geramita, A. V. and Maroscia, P. *The ideal of forms vanishing at a finite set of points of $\mathbf{P}^n$* , J. Alg. 90 (1984), 528–555.
- [GGR] Geramita, A. V., Gregory, D. and Roberts, L. *Minimal ideals and points in projective space*, J. Pure and Appl. Alg. 40 (1986), 33–62.

- [Gi] Gimigliano, A. *Our thin knowledge of fat points*, Queen's papers in Pure and Applied Mathematics, no. 83, The Curves Seminar at Queen's, vol. VI (1989).
- [H1] Harbourne, B. *Complete linear systems on rational surfaces*, Trans. A. M. S. 289 (1985), 213–226.
- [H2] Harbourne, B. *The geometry of rational surfaces and Hilbert functions of points in the plane*, Can. Math. Soc. Conf. Proc. 6 (1986), 95–111.
- [H3] Harbourne, B. *Points in Good Position in $\mathbf{P}^2$* , in: Zero-dimensional schemes, Proceedings of the International Conference held in Ravello, Italy, June 8–13, 1992, De Gruyter, 1994.
- [H4] Harbourne, B. *Anticanonical rational surfaces*, preprint (available via my Web page), 1994.
- [H5] Harbourne, B. *Free Resolutions of Fat Point Ideals on $\mathbf{P}^2$* , preprint (available via my Web page), 1995.
- [Hi] Hirschowitz, A. *Une conjecture pour la cohomologie des diviseurs sur les surfaces rationnelles generiques*, Journ. Reine Angew. Math. 397 (1989), 208–213.
- [HSV] Hoa, L.T., Stuckrad, J., and Vogel, W. *Towards a structure theory for projective varieties of degree = codimension + 2*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 71 (1991), 203–231.
- [I] Iarrobino, A. *Inverse system of a symbolic power, III: thin algebras and fat points*, preprint 1994.
- [L] Lorenzini, A. *The minimal resolution conjecture*, J. Alg. 156 (1991), 5–35.
- [Ma] Manin, Y. I. *Cubic Forms*. North-Holland Mathematical Library 4, 1986.
- [Mu] Mumford, D. *Varieties defined by quadratic equations*, in: Questions on algebraic varieties, Corso C.I.M.E. 1969 Rome: Cremonese, 1969, 30–100.
- [N1] Nagata, M. *On rational surfaces, II*, Mem. Coll. Sci. Univ. Kyoto, Ser. A Math. 33 (1960), 271–293.
- [N2] Nagata, M. *On the 14-th problem of Hilbert*, Amer. J. Math. 33 (1959), 766–772.
- [O] Okuyama, H. *A note on conjectures of the ideal of s -generic points in $\mathbf{P}^4$* , J. Math. Tokushima Univ. 25 (1991), 1–11.
- [Ra] Ramella, I. *An algorithmic approach to ideal generation of points*, Rend. Accad. Sci. Fis. Mat. Napoli (4) 56 (1989), 71–81.
- [Ro] Roberts, L. G. *A conjecture on Cohen-Macaulay type*, C. R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada 3 (1981), no. 1, 43–48.